

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed on November 4, 2003. In this Amendment, claims 1-5 are canceled, claims 7-8 were previously canceled, claim 6 is amended so that it is in independent form, and claims 9-16 are added so that claims 6, and 9-16 are pending and subject to examination on the merits. Since claim 6 is only being put into independent form, it does not raise new issues requiring further search and/or consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected as anticipated by Pu (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,573). These claims are canceled so that this rejection is obviated.

Claims 3-6 are rejected as obvious over Pu, Tagawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,313,095), and Choi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,284).

Pu is cited as a primary reference. Pu fails to teach "a drain region that is exposed through a molded body" as in claim 6. The Examiner alleges that Choi et al. shows a die surface that is exposed and that one skilled in the art would have been motivated to have modified Pu to improve heat dissipation and expose the bottom surface of an electrode.

The obviousness rejection as to claim 6 is improper since the alleged motivation is not from the prior art, but is from Applicant's own application. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and must not be based on applicant's disclosure (emphasis added). *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). MPEP § 904.01. Contrary to the Examiner's allegation, Choi et al. never states that the exposed bottom surface of the die in his package is an electrode or provides good heat dissipation properties. Although Choi et al. discloses an intermediate product in FIG. 6A which has an exposed die surface, Choi et al. later stacks two packages together so that the exposed die surfaces face inward to each other and *there is no exposed die surface in the final stacked package that is formed* (see FIGS. 7A and 8A of Choi et al.). Also, Choi et al. does not state that an exposed die surface "provide[s] improved heat dissipation" or provides for a "bottom surface electrode". Rather, *only Applicant's disclosure* indicates that an exposed die provides for good thermal performance and an electrical contact

(see page 3, lines 8 and 21 of the specification). Since the motivation to combine Pu and Choi et al. was taken from Applicant's own disclosure, the obviousness rejection is improper.

Applicant also submits that neither Pu, Tagawa et al., nor Choi et al. teach or suggest the invention as defined by independent claim 9. For example, none of the references teach or suggest a chip device comprising, *inter alia*, (a) a single leadframe comprising a base and a plurality of leads extending therefrom; (b) a first die comprising a first backside coupled to a first side of the base with a first solder material; (c) a second die comprising a second backside is coupled to the second side of the base opposite the first side of the base, wherein the second die is coupled to the second side of the base with a second solder material; and (d) *a molded body surrounding at least a portion of the leadframe, the first die, and the second side, wherein the first backside of the first die and the second backside of the second die are exposed through the molded body and are substantially coplanar with external surfaces of the molded body, and wherein the second backside forms a drain region of a power MOSFET in the second die.* Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 9 and dependents thereon are also allowable over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick R. Jewik
Reg. No. 40,456

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
PRJ:prj
60131650 v1